UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 4:15-CR-49-CDP

JASMINKA RAMIC,

Defendant.

SENTENCING HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CATHERINE D. PERRY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

JANUARY 5, 2016

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: Matthew Drake, AUSA

Howard J. Marcus, AUSA OFFICE OF U.S. ATTORNEY

111 South Tenth Street, 20th Floor

St. Louis, MO 63102

Mara M. Kohn, AUSA

Joshua D. Champagne, AUSA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20530

For Defendant: J. Christian Goeke, Esq.

LAW OFFICES OF J. CHRISTIAN GOEKE, P.C.

7711 Bonhomme Avenue, Suite 850

Clayton, MO 63105

REPORTED BY: Gayle D. Madden, CSR, RDR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

United States District Court

111 South Tenth Street, Third Floor

St. Louis, MO 63102 (314) 244-7987

(Produced by computer-aided mechanical stenography.)

2 1 (Proceedings commenced at 2:03 p.m.) 2 (The following proceedings were held in open court and 3 with the Defendant present.) 4 THE COURT: All right. We are here in the case of 5 United States of America versus Jasminka Ramic, Case No. 6 4:15-CR-49. Ms. Ramic, would you step forward? 7 We do have an interpreter here. I'm not sure how 8 much we will use her today, but I will ask the clerk to swear 9 the interpreter at this time. 10 (Interpreter Belma Salesevic sworn to interpret Bosnian 11 into English and English into Bosnian.) 12 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 13 We are here for sentencing, and the Defendant is here 14 in person and with her attorney, Mr. Goeke, and the United 15 States is here through Mr. Drake. 16 Mr. Goeke, is -- what's your expectation? Do we need 17 to use this -- does your client wish to use the interpreter? 18 MR. GOEKE: Your Honor, if the Court will recall, I 19 had an interpreter at the plea because of some of the 20 technicalities. I wanted to make sure, if there was some 21 misunderstanding, my client fully understood. I've never 22 needed an interpreter when I've met with her. I just spoke 23 with her, and she's comfortable not having the interpreter 24 interpret word-for-word what goes on this afternoon. If there's something she does not understand, she'll let me know 25

```
3
 1
     and then I can let the Court know maybe she needs an
 2
     interpretation if that would be okay with the Court.
             THE COURT: That's fine with me.
 3
              So, Ms. Ramic, is that okay with you?
 4
 5
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 6
              THE COURT: All right. If you need the services of
 7
     the interpreter or if you don't understand anything I'm
 8
     saying, please let me know. She's right here, and we can use
 9
     her if we need to, but if you tell me you do not need her,
10
     then we'll go ahead and speak English. Is that okay?
              THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
11
12
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. So both parties did
13
     file sentencing memoranda, and I have reviewed them, but there
14
     are not -- neither side had any actual objections to the
15
     Presentence Report. Is that correct?
16
             MR. GOEKE: For the Defendant, that is correct, Your
17
     Honor.
18
             MR. DRAKE: For the Government, that's also correct,
19
     Your Honor. Thank you.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Ramic, did you have a
21
     chance to go over the Presentence Report and discuss it with
22
    your lawyer?
2.3
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
24
             THE COURT: Was there anything in that report that
25
     you wanted him to object to that hasn't been resolved?
```

THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then I will adopt the Presentence Report as my findings of fact and my legal conclusions about the advisory Guidelines. As you all know, it does conclude that the advisory Guidelines, if it were not for the statutory maximum, would be far above the statutory maximum. So the maximum in this case is 60 months or five years in jail. The Guidelines would be 30 years. So it's a huge difference, but nevertheless, the Guidelines are 60 months. That's the range under the advisory Guidelines because of the statutory maximum.

So with that said, Mr. Goeke, I would ask you to make any statements on your client's behalf you would like, and then, of course, I'll give her a chance to say anything she wants.

MR. GOEKE: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll try to be brief. I know the Court reviewed the sentencing memorandum and the other documentations and exhibits that were attached thereto that I filed last month, but I'd like to -- I think it's important to reiterate some of the background that brings my client before the Court today. As I set out in my sentencing memorandum -- and I don't think there's any argument from the Government on this point -- Ms. Ramic is not a terrorist. She's not here because she is being accused of being a terrorist. What she is is a political refugee from

Bosnia who sought asylum in the United States in 2000. She's the mother of two teenaged children. She's a wife. She's also a Muslim women who's been a contributing member of the Christian Broadcasting Network 700 Club since 2008 and has had a long history of humanitarian involvement, especially revolving around children.

What really brings Ms. Ramic before the Court this afternoon is a military chemical attack launched by the Syrian government against Muslim citizens in August of 2013. Given her background and her long-term involvement in the humanitarian aid for children especially, what she saw as a result of the news clips and releases involving that attack were 1,300 or so people that were killed, many of them children, and hundreds of more children that were suffering as a result of the side effects of the poison gas.

At that point, Ms. Ramic made a decision that she wanted to do something to try to help those people, and I think that's exacerbated by what she went through when she was in the middle of the Bosnia conflict when she was a young child and the atrocities that she witnesses and endured. In doing so, she got onto Facebook, and she had connected with a person by the name of Ramo Pazara, who was a childhood friend or acquaintance from her hometown in Bosnia. Mr. Pazara was over in Syria, and she offered to help him, assist him in his endeavors there.

At that time, around the time of her first payment that she made -- well, back up for a second. As the Court's aware, she made some payments totaling \$700 towards somebody in St. Louis that was forwarded to Mr. Pazara at Mr. Pazara's request. When she made that first payment, around that time, what was also being -- what was in part being shown on Mr. Pazara's Facebook were pictures of orphans that he was helping, holding baskets of food and bread and other items that were being provided to assist them with their needs, and based upon that, Ms. Ramic decided to go forward and try to provide some assistance to Mr. Pazara and his group.

We don't dispute that as this went on things got more complicated. She got in over her head, and she did become aware that there was combat and that Mr. Pazara was involved in that combat and part of what was being sent over along with what she contributed included items that contributed towards that combat, and that's why she's before the Court here today, Your Honor.

I think it's clear that Ms. Ramic got involved in this for what were initially altruistic reasons, and that was to provide humanitarian aid to the people that she saw on the news clips over in Syria. She ultimately made some very, very poor decisions and engaged in some questionable activities that technically violated the statutes that constitute the criminal conduct for which she pled guilty and is before the

Court today for sentencing.

I did not reply to the Government's sentencing memorandum, but there's a couple points I would like to make if I may, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, you may.

MR. GOEKE: I believe that the Government's sentencing memorandum paints an overall picture of the conspiracy over a lengthy part of time, which in large part Ms. Ramic was not a part of or even aware of.

I don't want to overly minimize the scope of this conspiracy nor the consequences of the terrorist acts that certainly escalated over the course of the conspiracy, but Ms. Ramic's role, as set out in the Plea Agreement, was minimal and has been described on occasions as being diminutive.

I know the Court's made reference that -- the fact that the statutory maximum is only -- only five years. I say only five years to Ms. Ramic. That's a lot, but it's five years compared to what it would be under the Guidelines. She really doesn't get any -- under the Guideline calculation, she's really not getting any benefit because of her minimal role in this case.

Although the indictment charges that the conspiracy existed from May of 2013 to February 2015, I believe the evidence shows that Ms. Ramic cut off her contact altogether

with the conspiracy in February or March of 2014.

And I would like to also point out to the Court that the Government's memo also describes more recent al Qaeda and ISIS terrorist attacks, including the recent attacks in Paris and the downing of a Russian commercial plane. I think it's important to view the severity of Ms. Ramic's actions through what her understanding the belief was as to what, if any, threat Pazara and his group posed and the extent to which their activities would escalate in that regard and, again, with regard to what the media has — to what ISIS has done, quite frankly. I mean it's escalated. It's inflammatory. The name al Qaeda, the name ISIS is an inflammatory term that — as it should be. But at the time that Ms. Ramic was involved in these activities, it was not that inflammatory. And I believe it's unfair to conclude that Jasminka had any reason to believe otherwise.

Given her experiences during the Bosnian-Serbia conflict as set out in the PSR, our sentencing memorandum, and even the Government's sentencing memorandum, I believe this goes a long way in understanding Ms. Ramic's true motives and why she did what she did.

Finally, it was brought to my attention this morning by Ms. Ramic that her children are in Germany with her husband on visas, where she was at the time that she was arrested and extradited, which she did waive extradition on this case to

come back to the United States and face these charges, and it's come to my attention -- and I know she's had an immigration attorney in Germany working on her situation with regard to what the ramifications of this conviction will have on her ability to return to her family in Germany.

But I was made aware -- and I've had some contact with that German attorney, Your Honor, but I've had trouble communicating with him. Ms. Ramic informs me this morning that she had a conversation with her husband over the weekend by phone in which he had spoken with the attorney and that one of the collateral consequences if she does in fact receive prison time in this case would be that her children's visas may very well be canceled and to be forced with her husband to come back to the United States and leave the life that they had formed over in Germany. The reason she went to Germany to begin with was to be closer to his family and also be closer to her elderly parents that reside in Bosnia. So I'd ask the Court to take that into consideration as well.

THE COURT: Let me -- I know that the Defendant is a United States citizen. Are her children and husband citizens of the U.S.?

MR. GOEKE: They are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GOEKE: And the issue -- I understand that -- obviously, I'm not saying coming back -- I'm not alluding to

I will give my -- I mean I'm giving my oath because I am

25

honest that I will do my best to complete all stipulations placed by Court and follow the law. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Drake, on behalf of the United States, do you wish to make any statements?

MR. DRAKE: Just very briefly, Your Honor. Thank you.

Your Honor, I largely do not disagree with the factual synopsis that Mr. Goeke provided. All of that background concerning the Defendant and her personal and family circumstances, I believe, is accurate and correct.

I will say this, Judge. The Government is very cognizant of the Defendant's background, very cognizant of her role in the offense and took all of that into consideration in considering the fact that a superseding information would be filed as well as agreeing to a role-in-the-offense reduction, and so as we stand here today compared to the original indictment that was levied in the case, she has received a significant consideration from the Government in that regard.

And I think it bears stating that while that is a significant concession on the Government's part, an exercise of discretion, this is still a very serious offense. Frankly, the Government feels that a Guideline sentence would be appropriate.

It is true that even if or it may be true that even if the Defendant's initial motivations or intent were very

altruistic, I think it bears noting for the Court that she was certainly aware of what Mr. Pazara was doing in Syria. As is stated in the Plea Agreement, she was told by Mr. Hodzic, a Codefendant in the original case, as well as Mr. Pazara that they were engaged in activities in which people were dying; people were being martyred; they were in the battlefield fighting. So as a result of support and actions of others, the Defendants, including Ms. Ramic, knew that people were being killed. She specifically made reference to some of the terrorist organizations that were operating in the region.

THE COURT: Yeah, I mean the -- one of -- there's no dispute she did say in some email or posting or some communication to Mr. Pazara, "Are you fighting with al-Nusra or some of these other groups?" Right?

MR. DRAKE: Yes, Your Honor. And in response,
Mr. Pazara replied, "Well, I am, but all of those units -- all
of those brigades have been united under the Islamic State."
And while I agree with Mr. Goeke that the Islamic State has
certainly continued to evolve and become more and more
violent, Mr. Pazara was not bashful about his exploits and his
posts on Facebook about the activities he was engaged in -- in
combat, in armed conflict, in fighting, and things like that.

And while the Defendant -- I do understand the position that her motivations were in part to help women and children and were altruistic. She was also well aware of what

Mr. Pazara was doing. In fact, she even made references to 1 2 the fact that their communications could be deleted so that 3 other people would not be able to see them. And -- and 4 Mr. Hodzic, for instance, sent her pictures of the military 5 uniforms that he was sending over to Mr. Pazara in part with 6 the money that he was able to obtain from Ms. Ramic. 7 So my point, Judge, is not to belabor the point but 8 at least to point out to the Court that this is a very serious 9 offense, and the Defendant has gotten a substantial concession or consideration from the Government. 10 I would also point out that it is true that 11 12 Ms. Ramic's last communications with Mr. Pazara directly 13 ceased in February of 2015 -- 2015; however --14 THE COURT: '14. 15 MR. DRAKE: Or '14. Yeah. I'm sorry. Excuse me. 16 THE COURT: She was already arrested in 2015, right? 17 MR. DRAKE: Correct. She did -- she was --18 Mr. Hodzic is the one who informed her of Mr. Pazara's death 19 when he died on the battlefield in September of 2014, and I 20 think that part of that may be that, as was evident from 21 Mr. Pazara's Facebook page, his exploits continued to grow 22 more and more extreme, and Ms. Ramic was aware of what he was 23 doing and was aware of the support that she had provided to 24 him.

For those reasons, Judge, that's why the Government

25

14 1 thinks that a Guideline sentence would be appropriate. Again, 2 I'm not trying to belabor the point or disagree with Mr. Goeke 3 on the facts. He's right, but I think it bears consideration 4 from the Court in terms of the seriousness of the offense and 5 what's at stake here. Certainly, there are more Defendants 6 that are more culpable, and that's already been addressed, but 7 that's why we're asking for a Guideline sentence, Judge. 8 MR. GOEKE: If I may briefly, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 MR. GOEKE: Just in response. And I don't disagree 11 that Ms. Ramic received a communication from Mr. Hodzic in 12 September of 2014; however, I don't believe there's any 13 evidence there was any communication between she and anybody 14 in the conspiracy between February of 2014 and September 2014 15 when he just advised her, because he had her on his email or 16 Facebook page, what had happened to Pazara, and if you take a 17 look at what Ms. --THE COURT: Well, she sent the money in '13, right? 18 19 MR. GOEKE: And I was going to -- Ms. Ramic's 20 relevant conduct in this case, Your Honor, consists of a 21 period from August 20th, 2013 to December 23rd, 2013. 22 made three payments totaling \$700 along with first aid 23 supplies and hot chocolate, which she sent to Mr. Hodzic in 24 St. Louis at the direction of Mr. Pazara to be then forwarded 25 over to Syria to Mr. Pazara.

And with regard to how the pages or how the violence escalated on Mr. Pazara's Facebook page or website or whatever he had set up, I don't think there's any indication how much of that, if any, Ms. Ramic saw after she sent the last payment in December of 2013.

MR. DRAKE: Your Honor, I would agree with Mr. Goeke that the payments took place from September 30th of 2013 with the last one being on December 23rd of 2013, and I would also agree with him mostly her communications with Mr. Hodzic, I believe, ceased in March of 2014. He is correct that there were no other communications with other members of the conspiracy after that as far as the Government is aware, and I do believe that she did not have contact with Mr. Hodzic or Mr. Pazara after that date.

MR. GOEKE: And just to clarify, I believe the evidence shows that the only people she did actually have communication with or contact with was Roma Pazara and Mr. Hodzic.

MR. DRAKE: That's correct, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Those were the two.

Okay. Anything further?

So here's what I am going to do. I am going to vary slightly from the Guidelines and give you a slightly lower sentence, but I'm not going to do as your lawyer asks,

Ms. Ramic. I am going to sentence you to three years in jail.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

16 Obviously, you'll get credit for the time you've already been in custody. Three -- 36 months is -- it's two years off of the Guidelines range of 60 months or five years. I think under all of the circumstances of your case that this is sufficient but not greater than necessary to meet the sentencing objectives set out in the statute, and I specifically am basing my variance on a variety of factors. I've considered the Guidelines, of course, as well as the statutory, you know, maximum and the nature of the charge that you pleaded guilty to as opposed to the one you were initially charged with. This was a conspiracy where you did provide material

support or provided money that supported Mr. Pazara, and the evidence, as set out in the Presentence Report and as detailed in the -- in the Government's sentencing memorandum, shows that, you know, you sent him this money after you knew that he was fighting with a terrorist group, that you did make reference to deleting the communications, that there was -you know, that your references were to supporting the brothers and him, and although, obviously, in 2013, when you took these actions, ISIS had not engaged in some of the things that we now know from the news that it's engaging in, nevertheless, it was -- Mr. Pazara and whoever he was fighting with, which your conversations indicated you knew it was, you know, an organized group that was fighting, were engaged in violent

activities and killing people and -- and some being killed, and there was evidence that you knew about all of this.

So although I understand your motives to initially get involved in this may have been because of your concern for the innocent children and other people who were killed in the poison gas incident, your continuing in the actions you took show that you are guilty of this crime and that it's a very serious crime.

And so I think a sentence of three years in jail is appropriate because it's necessary to reflect the seriousness of the crime and provide appropriate punishment. Also, it's necessary to provide deterrence to you and others, to show people that this is a serious crime. It's not just a -- you know, it's not just something minor. Obviously, you know, I'm not going to say -- I understand the point about this Defendant not being a terrorist. I mean she's not taken up arms. She's not done anything like that, but she's been involved in this conspiracy, and -- and it is serious.

I am sorry if this will have consequences for your children and husband who -- who prefer to live in Germany. I don't know what the consequences will be, and I don't, obviously, have any say over what any kind of immigration people -- I don't even have any say over what immigration people in the United States do, much less in Germany, but I will note that criminal acts, whether it's the normal, you

know, drug dealing or identity theft type things that we deal with all the time in this court, do have consequences for family members, and it is sad. It is too bad, but we've had a lot worse consequences to people. People often lose their children to foster care. Very often, children are forced to move to foreign countries from the United States. So it's not really anything unusual that your children might have consequences. I hope they don't. I hope it works out so that they can stay wherever they wish to stay, but I cannot give you a lesser sentence on that basis. I do not believe it's appropriate when you consider all the facts of the case and the crime that you committed.

I have considered, as I said, all of the factors in this, in the -- the factors set out in the sentencing statute and believe that this is the appropriate sentence when all of those factors are considered.

In varying downward, I have also considered —— so it's clear —— the personal hardships and suffering that the Defendant has undergone in her life, both in being a refugee and the various things that have happened to her both during the war and afterward in her home country and the consequent mental health conditions and effects on her, and I realize those are serious things, and her health and mental health issues are something that I've taken into consideration.

That's part of why I'm giving her a sentence lower than the

five years in jail because she did suffer during the Bosnian conflict and she continued to suffer when she attempted to move back to Bosnia after that conflict was over, and so, you know, those are the reasons she came to the United States, and I'm not -- I'm not discounting the seriousness of those, but I still think that the crime in this case does require a serious sentence and three years in jail meets that, is sufficient to meet that -- reflect the seriousness.

So it is the Judgment of the Court that the Defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 36 months.

Upon release from imprisonment, the Defendant will be placed on supervised release for a term of three years.

Within 72 hours of release, the Defendant shall report in person to the Probation Office in the district to which she is released.

While on supervision, the Defendant must comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by the Court and with the following additional conditions, and if any of these conditions have costs, then the Defendant must pay the costs of the services based on a copayment fee established by the Probation Office.

Excuse me.

The Defendant must submit her person, residence, office, computer, or vehicle to a search conducted by the

Probation Office based upon reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a violation of a condition of release, and she must warn any other residents of her premises about this condition, and I impose that condition specifically because of the nature of this offense and the fact that much of the crime was committed from her home and her computer or facilitated by the computer.

Additionally, I will -- as a condition of supervision, the Defendant must participate in a mental health evaluation and follow any recommendations of the evaluator and/or participate in a mental health program approved by the Probation Office.

The -- additionally, the Defendant must provide the Probation Office with access to any requested financial information, and this relates to the nature of the crime.

Based on the low risk that the Defendant poses for future substance abuse, I will suspend the mandatory statutory drug testing requirements.

I find that the Defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine, and, therefore, no fine is imposed. It is ordered, however, that the Defendant must pay to the United States a special assessment of \$100, and that is due immediately.

So this will be the sentence in the case, and I have stated my reasons for it. Ms. Ramic, if you wish to appeal

```
21
     from this sentence, any appeal by you must be filed within 14
 1
 2
     days of today's date. If you do not file a Notice of Appeal
 3
     within 14 days, you'll be forever giving up your right to do
 4
     so. You are entitled to be represented by an attorney in
 5
     taking an appeal, and if you can't afford one, an attorney
 6
     will be appointed to represent you at no cost, and if you
 7
     request, the Clerk of Court will assist you in filing a Notice
 8
     of Appeal.
 9
              The United States also has the right to appeal this
10
     sentence.
11
              Probation suggested that I might recommend to the
12
     Bureau of Prisons that the Defendant be evaluated for mental
13
     health treatment while in the bureau. Do you want me to make
14
     that recommendation?
15
              MR. GOEKE: Yes, please, Your Honor.
16
              THE COURT: And do you want me to make any other
17
     recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons?
              MR. GOEKE: Yes, Your Honor. I'd request that the
18
19
     Court make a recommendation that Ms. Ramic serve her sentence
20
     in a facility as close to Rockford, Illinois, as possible.
21
              THE COURT: Do they still have women in Peoria?
22
              MR. GOEKE: I don't know.
23
              THE COURT: I don't know either. I don't know what
```

24 the -- I don't know where the Bureau of Prisons will put you, 25 Ms. Ramic, but I will recommend to them that they house you as

```
22
     close to your home as Rockford -- in Rockford, Illinois, as
 1
 2
    meets their regulations. They usually do try to follow that,
 3
    but if they don't, there's nothing I can do about that. Do
 4
    you understand?
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT: All right. I will make that
 7
    recommendation.
 8
              Anything further from the Government?
 9
              MR. DRAKE: Yes, Judge. As part of the original
10
     agreement, the Government agreed to move for the dismissal of
11
     Counts I and III as to this Defendant in the original
12
     indictment, and I would do so at this time.
13
              THE COURT: Counts I and III of the original
     indictment are dismissed at this time as to this Defendant.
14
15
              Is there -- was there a forfeiture in this case?
16
              Not as to this Defendant?
17
              MR. DRAKE: Not as to this Defendant, Judge.
18
     you.
19
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. That's fine.
20
              All right. Then the Defendant then is remanded to
21
     the custody of the Marshals for imposition of sentence.
22
              MR. GOEKE: Thank you, Your Honor.
23
              THE COURT: Court's in recess.
24
          (Proceedings concluded at 2:32 p.m.)
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Gayle D. Madden, Registered Diplomate Reporter and Certified Realtime Reporter, hereby certify that I am a duly appointed Official Court Reporter of the United States

District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri.

I further certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings held in the above-entitled case and that said transcript is a true and correct transcription of my stenographic notes.

I further certify that this transcript contains pages 1 through 22 inclusive.

Dated at St. Louis, Missouri, this 21st day of August, 2016.

/s/ Gayle D. Madden

GAYLE D. MADDEN, CSR, RDR, CRR

Official Court Reporter